Research Square

Preprints are preliminary reports that have not undergone peer review.
They should not be considered conclusive, used to inform clinical practice,
or referenced by the media as validated information.

The Future of Learning is Hybrid: Exploration of EdTech's Role in Shaping the Post-Pandemic Educational Landscape

Sayed Mahbub Hasan Amiri

amiri@drmc.edu.bd

Dhaka Residential Model College https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2349-2143

Prasun Goswami

Dhaka Residential Model College https://orcid.org/0009-0006-4771-212X

Md. Mainul Islam

Dhaka Residential Model College

Mohammad Sohel Kabir

Cumilla Shikkha Board Government Model College https://orcid.org/0009-0000-5224-6043

Mohammad Shakhawat Hossen

Char Adarsha College https://orcid.org/0009-0006-8335-7129

Chandan Kumar Barmmon

The Daily Ittefaq

Sayed Majhab Hasan Amiri

Dhaka College https://orcid.org/0009-0000-5980-8942

Research Article

Keywords: Hybrid Learning, Educational Technology, Post-Pandemic Education, Digital Divide, Equity in Education, Future of Education

Posted Date: October 3rd, 2025

DOI: https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-7754491/v1

License: This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.
Read Full License

Additional Declarations: The authors declare no competing interests.

Abstract

The global COVID-19 pandemic acted as a profound catalyst, forcing an unprecedented and rapid shift to remote learning and exposing both the potential and the deep-seated vulnerabilities within global education systems. This paper argues that the post-pandemic educational landscape is irrevocably shifting towards a hybrid learning model, which integrates face-to-face instruction with technology-mediated learning experiences. This transition is not merely a temporary adjustment but a fundamental restructuring of pedagogical delivery, with Educational Technology (EdTech) at its core. The paper explores the dual role of EdTech as both an enabler of flexibility, personalization, and accessibility, and a potential amplifier of existing inequalities the "digital divide." Through a thematic analysis of recent literature, this study examines key themes, including the redefinition of teacher and student roles, the importance of digital pedagogy over mere tool usage, and the critical need for robust infrastructure and educator professional development. The conclusion posits that the successful implementation of a hybrid future is contingent upon a strategic, equitable, and pedagogically grounded integration of EdTech, moving beyond emergency remote teaching to create a more resilient, inclusive, and effective educational ecosystem.

1. Introduction

The global education system experienced a seismic disruption in early 2020, as the COVID-19 pandemic forced an unprecedented closure of schools and universities worldwide. Overnight, the familiar rhythms of classroom instruction were replaced by a frantic scramble to maintain educational continuity through digital means. This period, widely characterized as “emergency remote teaching” (ERT), was not a planned or pedagogically refined shift to online learning, but a necessary crisis response (Hodges et al., 2020). While this emergency phase exposed profound vulnerabilities from glaring digital inequities to teacher unpreparedness it also served as a massive, unplanned global experiment in technology-mediated education. As the immediate threat of the pandemic recedes, the educational landscape is not simply reverting to its pre-2020 state. Instead, we stand at a critical juncture, poised to integrate the hard-won lessons of this period into a new, more resilient model. This paper argues that the post-pandemic future of education is inherently hybrid, and that Educational Technology (EdTech) will play a pivotal, yet complex, role in shaping this landscape. The central challenge and opportunity lie in moving beyond the reactive measures of ERT to design intentional, equitable, and effective hybrid learning ecosystems that leverage EdTech not as a mere substitute, but as a transformative tool for enhancing flexibility, personalization, and inclusion.

The abrupt pivot to remote learning illuminated both the immense potential and the stark limitations of technology in education. On one hand, it accelerated the adoption of digital tools at a scale previously unimaginable. Learning Management Systems (LMS) like Canvas and Moodle, video conferencing platforms like Zoom and Microsoft Teams, and a plethora of educational apps became central to the learning process (Williamson et al., 2020). This forced immersion demonstrated how technology could facilitate continuity of instruction, enable new forms of collaboration, and provide a degree of flexibility

for students and educators. On the other hand, the crisis starkly revealed the digital divide in its most visceral form. The term, which refers to the gap between those with and without access to modern information technology, proved to be a chasm (Van Dijk, 2020). Inequities in access to reliable internet connectivity, adequate digital devices, and a conducive learning environment at home became primary determinants of educational access, exacerbating pre-existing socioeconomic disparities (UNESCO, 2020). This period made it undeniably clear that simply providing digital content is insufficient; true access requires a holistic ecosystem of technology, connectivity, digital literacy, and support.

It is crucial to distinguish between the emergency remote teaching of the pandemic and the concept of hybrid or blended learning that this paper advocates for. Hodges et al. (2020) emphatically clarified that ERT is a temporary shift of instructional delivery to an alternate mode due to crisis circumstances. Its primary goal is to provide temporary, reliable access to instruction and pedagogical support in a manner that is quick to set up and reliably available during an emergency. In contrast, hybrid learning (often used interchangeably with blended learning) is a formal education program in which a student learns, at least in part, through online learning with some element of student control over time, place, path, and/or pace, and, at least in part, at a supervised brick-and-mortar location away from home (Staker & Horn, 2012). The key difference is intentionality and design. Hybrid learning is the product of careful planning, pedagogical models, and instructional design, where the integration of face-to-face and online components is purposeful and complementary. The post-pandemic task, therefore, is to transition from the reactive, and often deficient, practices of ERT to the deliberate and refined strategies of hybrid learning.

The thesis of this paper is that the future of learning will be fundamentally shaped by a hybrid model, with EdTech at its core, but that its successful implementation is contingent upon proactively addressing the challenges of equity, pedagogical shift, and systemic support that the pandemic laid bare. EdTech is not a silver bullet; its role is dualistic. It functions as both a powerful enabler capable of personalizing learning pathways through adaptive algorithms, fostering collaboration across geographical boundaries, and providing educators with rich data on student progress and a potential amplifier of inequality, if issues of access and digital literacy are not systematically resolved (Zhao, 2020). The trajectory of this hybrid future is not predetermined by technology itself, but by the pedagogical, philosophical, and policy choices we make now.

To explore this complex terrain, this paper is guided by several key research objectives. First, it seeks to conceptualize hybrid learning in the specific context of the post-pandemic educational landscape, building on pre-existing models but incorporating the lessons of the global crisis. Second, it will analyse the specific opportunities EdTech presents for creating more engaging, flexible, and student-cantered learning experiences. Third, and with equal importance, it will identify and critically examine the significant challenges, with a particular focus on the multifaceted nature of the digital divide and the urgent need for comprehensive teacher professional development. Finally, the paper aims to synthesize these analyses into a proposed framework for the equitable, sustainable, and pedagogically sound implementation of hybrid learning models.

The structure of this paper will follow a logical progression to address these objectives. Following this introduction, a comprehensive literature review will explore the historical context of blended learning, the expanding EdTech ecosystem, relevant pedagogical theories such as the Community of Inquiry framework (Garrison et al., 2000), and the central challenges of equity and the changing role of educators. The methodology section will outline the qualitative approach of a systematic literature review that forms the basis of this analysis. The subsequent findings and discussion section will present a thematic analysis of the literature, organized around the key opportunities and barriers identified. This will lead to a proposed framework for an equitable hybrid future, offering recommendations for policy, practice, and future research. Ultimately, this paper contends that by learning from the trials of the pandemic, the education community can harness the potential of EdTech to co-create a hybrid future that is not only more technologically integrated but also more resilient, inclusive, and effective for all learners.

2. Literature Review

2.1. From Emergency Remote Teaching to Intentional Hybrid Learning

The seismic shift in education during the COVID-19 pandemic necessitates a clear conceptual distinction between the immediate response and the envisioned future. As Hodges et al. (2020) compellingly argue, the widespread adoption of online learning during the crisis should be accurately termed Emergency Remote Teaching (ERT). This was not a deliberate migration to a refined online learning model but a temporary shift of instructional delivery to an alternate mode out of sheer necessity. The primary goal of ERT was not to create a robust educational ecosystem but to provide immediate, temporary access to instruction and pedagogical support in a manner that was quick to establish and reliably available. This reactive approach often resulted in a diluted version of classroom instruction, characterized by didactic video lectures, overwhelming workloads, and a pronounced sense of isolation among students and faculty alike (Bozkurt & Sharma, 2020). The focus was on survival and continuity, leaving little room for the pedagogical design, interactive engagement, and assessment strategies that define quality distance education.

In stark contrast to ERT, Hybrid or Blended Learning represents a formally planned and pedagogically grounded approach. While definitions vary, a consensus view describes it as a formal education program in which a student learns through a blend of online learning with some element of student control over time, place, path, and/or pace and supervised face-to-face instruction at a physical location (Staker & Horn, 2012; Horn & Staker, 2014). The key differentiator is intentionality. Hybrid learning is the product of careful instructional design, where the integration of synchronous and asynchronous, online and in-person components is purposeful and complementary. Each mode is leveraged for its strengths; for instance, face-to-face time may be reserved for interactive discussions, collaborative projects, and hands-on activities, while online modules can deliver core content, allowing for self-paced review and

freeing up valuable classroom time for higher-order learning (Garrison & Kanuka, 2004). The post-pandemic imperative, therefore, is to consciously transition from the emergency stopgap measures of ERT to the strategically designed, student-cantered paradigms of hybrid learning, integrating the lessons learned from the crisis into a more resilient and flexible educational model.

This evolution did not begin with the pandemic. The historical context of blended learning pre-dates 2020, with roots in distance education and computer-assisted instruction. The early 2000s saw the rise of Learning Management Systems (LMS) like Blackboard and Moodle, which began to supplement traditional courses with online resources. The term "blended learning" gained traction as educators experimented with flipping the classroom having students consume lecture content at home and using class time for active learning (Bergmann & Sams, 2012). Over the past decade, models such as the Rotation Model (Station Rotation, Lab Rotation, Flipped Classroom), Flex Model, and A La Carte Model were developed and implemented in various K-12 and higher education settings (Christensen Institute, 2013). The pandemic, therefore, did not invent blended learning but acted as a powerful accelerator, forcing a global-scale experiment that has both validated its potential and exposed the complexities of its implementation, setting the stage for its more mature and widespread adoption in the years to come.

2.2. The Expanding EdTech Ecosystem

The viability of hybrid learning is fundamentally dependent on the technological tools that facilitate it. The EdTech ecosystem, which expanded at an unprecedented rate during the pandemic, now comprises a diverse and sophisticated array of platforms and applications. At the foundational layer are Learning Management Systems (LMS) such as Canvas, Moodle, and Google Classroom, which serve as the central hub for course administration, content distribution, assignment submission, and grade management. These platforms provide the essential infrastructure for organizing the hybrid learning experience. Complementing LMSs are synchronous video conferencing tools like Zoom, Microsoft Teams, and Google Meet, which became the lifeline for real-time interaction during remote phases, enabling virtual classrooms, breakout rooms for small-group work, and direct student-instructor communication (Moorhouse, 2020).

Beyond these foundational tools, the ecosystem includes more specialized applications that enable personalized and engaging learning. Adaptive learning platforms (e.g., Khan Academy, DreamBox) use algorithms to adjust the difficulty and type of content presented to a student based on their performance in real-time, providing a customized learning path. Gamification apps (e.g., Kahoot!, Quizizz, Duolingo) incorporate game-like elements such as points, badges, and leaderboards to increase motivation and engagement. Looking toward the future, emerging technologies are poised to play a larger role. AI-powered tutoring systems can provide students with instant, personalized feedback and support, simulating one-on-one tutoring at scale. Meanwhile, Virtual and Augmented Reality (VR/AR) technologies offer immersive experiences, allowing students to take virtual field trips, conduct complex science experiments in simulated labs, or interact with 3D historical models, thereby overcoming physical and resource limitations (Kavanagh et al., 2017).

A critical function of this expanded ecosystem is the generation and utilization of data. Learning analytics involves the measurement, collection, analysis, and reporting of data about learners and their contexts to understand and optimize learning and the environments in which it occurs (Siemens & Long, 2011). In a hybrid model, data from LMS interactions, assessment scores, and time-on-task can provide instructors with powerful insights into student progress, engagement levels, and potential areas of struggle. This data can inform just-in-time interventions, personalize learning resources, and help educators identify which students may need additional support, moving from a reactive to a proactive support system. However, the ethical use of this data, concerning student privacy and the avoidance of algorithmic bias, remains a significant area of concern and ongoing research (Ifenthaler & Yau, 2020).

2.3. Pedagogical Shifts and Theoretical Underpinnings

The effective integration of technology in a hybrid model demands a concomitant shift in pedagogy. Simply transferring traditional lecture-based methods to a video call represents a missed opportunity and often leads to poor outcomes. The hybrid paradigm necessitates a move from instructor-cantered to student-cantered learning models. Constructivist theories, which posit that learners actively construct knowledge through experiences and interactions, provide a strong theoretical foundation (Vygotsky, 1978). In a hybrid context, this translates to designing learning activities that promote active exploration, collaboration, and problem-solving, both online and in-person. The instructor's role evolves from a primary source of information to a facilitator who guides students as they engage with content, tools, and each other.

A pivotal framework for understanding and designing for meaningful learning experiences in online and hybrid environments is the Community of Inquiry (CoI) model (Garrison et al., 2000). The CoI framework posits that deep and meaningful learning occurs at the intersection of three interdependent presences: Social Presence (the ability of participants to project themselves socially and emotionally as "real" people), Cognitive Presence (the extent to which learners are able to construct and confirm meaning through sustained reflection and discourse), and Teaching Presence (the design, facilitation, and direction of cognitive and social processes for realizing personally meaningful and educationally worthwhile learning outcomes). In a hybrid setting, fostering these presences requires intentional design. For example, teaching presence is established through clear course structure and proactive facilitation; social presence is built through icebreaker activities and collaborative projects; and cognitive presence is developed through challenging discussions and reflective assignments that trigger a cycle of inquiry (Garrison & Arbaugh, 2007).

This leads to the crucial concept of Digital Pedagogy, which goes beyond merely using digital tools. It is not about finding high-tech alternatives for existing practices but about rethinking teaching and learning in light of the new affordances and constraints of technology (Stommel, 2013). Digital pedagogy asks *why* a specific tool is being used and *how* it enhances the learning objective. It prioritizes critical thinking, collaboration, and creation over passive consumption. For instance, instead of using a discussion forum simply to answer a question, a digitally pedagogical approach might have students co-create a multimedia resource or engage in a peer-reviewed debate. It is the thoughtful, critical, and

purposeful integration of technology to achieve pedagogical goals, ensuring that the tool serves the learning, not the other way around.

2.4. The Central Challenge: Equity and the Digital Divide

Perhaps the most glaring issue highlighted by the pandemic was the pervasive and multifaceted nature of the digital divide. This divide is not a single binary but a spectrum of inequities that, if unaddressed, threaten to undermine the inclusive potential of hybrid learning. The first layer is the Access Divide, which refers to disparities in the basic physical means to participate in digital learning. This includes a lack of access to reliable high-speed internet, adequate computing devices (e.g., laptops or tablets), and even a quiet, conducive space to learn at home (UNESCO, 2020). The pandemic revealed that these were not minor concerns but fundamental barriers that disproportionately affected students from low-income households, rural communities, and marginalized groups, effectively excluding them from educational participation.

Beyond physical access, the Usage Divide pertains to inequalities in the skills, knowledge, and support needed to effectively use technology for learning. This encompasses digital literacy the ability to find, evaluate, create, and communicate information using digital technology among students, teachers, and parents (Van Dijk, 2020). A student may have a device and internet connection but lack the skills to navigate an LMS, critically evaluate online information, or collaborate effectively in a digital environment. Similarly, teachers may struggle with the pedagogical integration of new tools, and parents may be unable to support their children's learning at home. This skills gap can be as prohibitive as a lack of hardware.

Ultimately, these divides culminate in the Outcome Divide, where inequities in access and usage translate directly into widening educational achievement gaps. Students without reliable technology or digital fluency are likely to fall behind their peers, leading to lower grades, higher dropout rates, and reduced long-term opportunities (Van Dijk, 2020). This outcome divide reinforces existing socioeconomic inequalities, creating a vicious cycle. Therefore, implementing a hybrid model without a robust and comprehensive strategy to address all layers of the digital divide through policies ensuring universal broadband access, device provision programs, and digital literacy training for all stakeholders risks creating a system that is more technologically advanced but profoundly unequal.

2.5. The Changing Role of the Educator

The transition to a hybrid model necessitates a fundamental redefinition of the educator's role. The traditional model of the teacher as the "sage on the stage," the primary source of knowledge transmitting information to passive students, is ill-suited for a dynamic hybrid environment. Instead, the educator must embrace the role of a "guide on the side" and, more importantly, a "learning designer" (King, 1993). This involves curating high-quality digital resources, designing engaging and interactive learning activities for both online and in-person settings, and creating pathways that allow for student choice and autonomy. The teacher becomes a facilitator of learning processes, a mentor who provides personalized support, and an architect of the learning experience.

This shift demands a new skill set. Technological Proficiency is now a baseline requirement, extending beyond basic operational knowledge of platforms to an understanding of how to leverage different tools to achieve specific learning outcomes. Furthermore, hybrid environments require new forms of classroom management or rather, "learning environment management" that span physical and digital spaces. This includes establishing clear norms for online interaction, fostering a positive and inclusive class culture in a blended setting, and managing time effectively across synchronous and asynchronous modalities.

Consequently, the need for high-quality, continuous, and relevant professional development (PD) has never been more critical. One-off workshops on how to use a specific tool are insufficient. Effective PD must be ongoing, collaborative, and pedagogically focused, helping teachers understand *why* and *how* to integrate technology in ways that enhance learning (Trust & Prestridge, 2021). It should involve opportunities for peer coaching, lesson study, and the creation of professional learning communities (PLCs) where teachers can share successes and challenges. Investment in empowering educators as designers and facilitators is the single most important factor in determining whether the shift to hybrid learning succeeds in improving educational outcomes or merely adds a layer of complexity to an already strained system.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Approach

This paper employs a qualitative research design utilizing a systematic literature review methodology to comprehensively explore and synthesize the existing body of knowledge on the role of Educational Technology (EdTech) in shaping the post-pandemic hybrid educational landscape. A systematic review is distinct from a traditional narrative literature review in its rigorous, transparent, and reproducible methodology, which aims to minimize bias and provide a robust summary of evidence on a specific research question (Snyder, 2019). This approach is particularly suited to the research objectives, as the field of post-pandemic education is rapidly evolving, with a surge of publications from diverse disciplines including education, technology studies, sociology, and public policy. A systematic review allows for the systematic identification, evaluation, and synthesis of this vast and fragmented literature to provide a coherent and evidence-based analysis of current trends, consensus points, and critical gaps (Xiao & Watson, 2019).

The qualitative nature of this inquiry is driven by the aim to understand complex, interwoven phenomena such as pedagogical shifts, equity challenges, and the changing role of educators that are not easily quantifiable. Rather than seeking statistical generalizability, this study aims for analytical generalizability, developing a nuanced conceptual framework that can explain the dynamics at play in the transition to hybrid learning (Firestone, 1993). The systematic review process followed in this paper is adapted from established guidelines, such as those outlined by the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) statement, which provides a framework for ensuring the review's

thoroughness and accountability, even when a meta-analysis of quantitative data is not being conducted (Page et al., 2021). This structured process ensures that the synthesis of literature is not based on a selective or haphazard collection of sources but is the result of a deliberate and documented search strategy.

3.2. Data Collection

The data collection process was designed to capture the most relevant and high-quality literature published during a period of intense change and research activity. The sources for this review were deliberately selected to include a wide range of scholarly and grey literature. The primary sources are peer-reviewed academic articles from leading journals in education and technology, which provide empirically validated findings and theoretical contributions. To capture in-depth analyses, academic books and chapters were also included. Furthermore, given the policy-oriented nature of the topic, conference proceedings from key organizations like the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) and the Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE) were consulted to include cutting-edge, albeit less formalized, research. Finally, recognizing the global scope of the pandemic's impact, reports from major international organizations such as UNESCO, the World Bank, the OECD, and the European Commission were incorporated. These reports offer valuable macro-level data, policy analyses, and insights from diverse international contexts that are essential for a comprehensive understanding (Viner et al., 2020).

The temporal scope of the search was focused on literature published primarily between 2020 and 2024. This timeframe was chosen to capture the immediate response to the pandemic (2020–2022) and the subsequent period of reflection, analysis, and early implementation of more sustainable hybrid models (2022–2024). While seminal pre-2020 works on blended learning theory and the digital divide were included to provide necessary historical and theoretical context, the emphasis remained on literature that directly addressed the post-pandemic landscape. The search was conducted across several major academic databases to ensure broad coverage and mitigate the database-specific biases. These included:

- Google Scholar: For its extensive coverage across disciplines and ability to capture newer or less formally published works.
- JSTOR: For its deep archive of humanities and social sciences journals.
- ERIC (Education Resources Information Center): As the premier database for education research.
- Scopus and ScienceDirect: For their comprehensive coverage of peer-reviewed literature and strong inclusion of international journals.

The search strategy employed a combination of keywords and Boolean operators to construct complex search queries tailored to each database. The keywords were derived from the research objectives and central concepts of the paper. Primary search strings included combinations of terms such as:

- ("post-pandemic" OR "COVID-19") AND ("education" OR "learning")

- ("hybrid learning" OR "blended learning") AND ("future" OR "model")
- ("EdTech" OR "educational technology") AND ("equity" OR "digital divide")
- ("teacher role" OR "teacher professional development") AND ("hybrid" OR "online")
- ("digital pedagogy" OR "Community of Inquiry") AND ("higher education" OR "K-12")

These search strings were iteratively refined based on initial results to balance sensitivity (finding all relevant records) and specificity (excluding irrelevant records). The initial search yielded a large number of records (e.g., over 2,000). The first stage of screening involved reviewing titles and abstracts against pre-defined inclusion and exclusion criteria. Inclusion criteria were: (1) publication between 2020–2024 (with exceptions for foundational texts); (2) focus on hybrid/blended learning, EdTech, or related pedagogical shifts; (3) relevance to at least one of the research objectives. Exclusion criteria were: (1) articles not available in English; (2) articles focused solely on fully online or fully face-to-face learning without a hybrid component; (3) brief opinion pieces or editorials without substantial analysis. This process resulted in a final corpus of approximately 150–200 documents that formed the basis for the in-depth analysis.

3.3. Data Analysis

The analysis of the selected literature was conducted using thematic analysis, a method for identifying, analyzing, and reporting patterns (themes) within qualitative data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This method was chosen for its flexibility and systematic approach to synthesizing large volumes of textual data from diverse sources. The analysis followed a multi-stage iterative process. First, the researcher engaged in repeated and active reading of the full-text articles and reports to achieve familiarization with the depth and breadth of the corpus. During this phase, initial notes and ideas for codes were generated.

The second stage involved generating initial codes. Coding is the process of organizing the data into meaningful groups. Using a qualitative data analysis software (e.g., NVivo or a similar coding system), salient features of the data that were relevant to the research questions were systematically tagged. Initial codes were both data-driven (inductive), emerging from the content of the literature itself, and concept-driven (deductive), informed by the preliminary outline and research objectives. Examples of initial codes included: "ERT vs. Hybrid Definition," "LMS Usage," "Adaptive Learning," "Digital Divide - Access," "Digital Divide - Skills," "Teacher as Designer," "Professional Development Models," "Community of Inquiry," and "Policy Recommendations."

The third stage was the central process of theme development. This involved collating the codes into potential themes, gathering all the data relevant to each potential theme, and reviewing these candidate themes. This review occurred at two levels: first, checking if the coded data formed a coherent pattern within the theme, and second, ensuring that the themes accurately reflected the meaning of the entire dataset (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Through this iterative process, the initial codes were refined and consolidated into the overarching themes that structure the Findings and Discussion section of this paper. These themes directly mirror the research objectives and include:

1. Hybrid Learning as a Model for Flexibility and Personalization.
2. The Persistence of the Digital Divide as a Primary Barrier.
3. The Non-Negotiable Investment in Educator Capacity.
4. Redefining Success and Assessment.

Finally, the analysis moved to defining and naming these themes, ensuring each was distinct and significant, and weaving them into a coherent narrative that addresses the research question. This narrative synthesis, presented in the next section, does not merely list findings but interprets and connects them, highlighting convergences, contradictions, and gaps in the existing literature to provide a critical and comprehensive overview of the field.

3.4. Limitations

While this systematic literature review provides a valuable synthesis of current knowledge, it is important to acknowledge its limitations. First, the rapidly evolving nature of EdTech presents a significant challenge. The publication cycle for academic research can be lengthy, meaning that findings related to specific technologies or implementation models may become dated relatively quickly. The landscape of tools and practices is in constant flux, and this review, by relying on published literature, may not capture the very latest innovations or real-time shifts occurring in classrooms today.

Second, the study is constrained by the inherent biases and focuses of the existing literature. There is a potential for publication bias, where studies with positive or significant findings are more likely to be published than those with null or negative results. This could lead to an overly optimistic view of hybrid learning's effectiveness. Furthermore, the literature may have geographic and contextual biases. A large proportion of published research originates from North America, Europe, and East Asia, potentially limiting the generalizability of findings to low- and middle-income countries or specific cultural contexts where challenges and resources differ substantially (Tahiru, 2021). The experiences of well-resourced universities, for example, may not translate to underfunded public school systems.

Third, and fundamentally, this paper is a conceptual and theoretical analysis based solely on secondary sources. It does not include primary empirical data collection, such as interviews with educators, surveys of students, or observational case studies. Therefore, it can synthesize what others have reported but cannot provide new, firsthand evidence of the phenomena being studied. The conclusions are interpretive and based on the aggregation of existing research, which itself may have methodological limitations. These limitations, however, also point to clear directions for future research, including the need for longitudinal studies, more research in underrepresented contexts, and primary investigations into the long-term outcomes of well-implemented hybrid models.

4. Findings and Discussion

The systematic review of literature reveals a complex and nuanced picture of the post-pandemic educational landscape. The analysis synthesizes findings into four central themes that encapsulate the

primary opportunities, challenges, and necessary evolutions inherent in the shift towards a hybrid learning model powered by Educational Technology. These themes are not isolated; they are deeply interconnected; each influencing and being influenced by the others in a dynamic system.

4.1. Theme 1: Hybrid Learning as a Model for Flexibility and Personalization

A dominant finding in the literature is the reconceptualization of hybrid learning as a powerful vehicle for providing unprecedented levels of flexibility and personalization, moving beyond the one-size-fits-all model of traditional schooling. EdTech is the critical enabler of this shift, allowing for learning experiences to be tailored to individual student needs, paces, and interests in ways that were logistically impossible in a purely face-to-face setting. The core of this personalization lies in the decoupling of learning from the rigid constraints of time and place. Asynchronous online components, such as pre-recorded video lectures, interactive modules, and digital readings, empower students with agency over their learning path, allowing them to review difficult concepts, skip ahead on familiar material, and learn at the time of day they are most productive (Bond et al., 2021). This flexibility is particularly beneficial for diverse learners, including adult learners balancing education with work and family commitments, students with health issues, and those with unique learning disabilities or giftedness who require a differentiated approach.

The potential for differentiated instruction is significantly amplified in a well-designed hybrid environment. Adaptive learning technologies, which use algorithms to adjust the difficulty and type of content based on a student's real-time performance, can create a customized learning journey for each individual (Xie et al., 2019). For example, a platform might present additional practice problems to a student struggling with a math concept while offering more challenging, enrichment activities to a student who has demonstrated mastery. This ensures that all students are appropriately challenged and supported, reducing both boredom and frustration. Furthermore, the data generated by these platforms provide teachers with detailed analytics on student progress, flagging knowledge gaps early and enabling timely, targeted interventions. This moves the educational model from a reactive to a proactive support system. As Trust and Whalen (2020) argue, this data-informed approach allows educators to shift from teaching to the "average" student to understanding and addressing the needs of each learner in a more precise and effective manner.

However, the literature also sounds a note of caution. The successful implementation of personalized, flexible learning is contingent upon a high degree of student self-regulation and metacognitive skills. Students who lack the discipline or executive function to manage their time and navigate open-ended learning environments may flounder without the structure of a traditional classroom (Broadbent & Poon, 2015). This highlights the critical role of the educator in scaffolding these skills and designing hybrid courses with clear structures, milestones, and support mechanisms. The promise of personalization is not realized by technology alone but through the careful pedagogical design that embeds choice,

support, and clear expectations within the flexible framework. The hybrid model, therefore, does not diminish the teacher's role but elevates it to that of a learning architect and personal coach.

Table 1
EdTech Tools and Their Role in Enabling Flexibility and Personalization

Type of EdTech Tool	Function in Hybrid Learning	Contribution to Flexibility/Personalization
Learning Management System (LMS)	Central hub for content, activities, and communication.	Provides a structured yet flexible pathway; allows students to access materials and submit work asynchronously.
Adaptive Learning Platforms	Adjusts content difficulty and type based on student performance.	Creates a unique, self-paced learning path for each student; provides immediate feedback and remediation.
Video Lecture Libraries	Repository of recorded instructor-led content.	Enables students to learn at their own pace, pausing, rewinding, and reviewing as needed.
Collaboration Tools (e.g., Padlet, Miro)	Facilitates brainstorming and project work in digital spaces.	Supports flexible, asynchronous collaboration among students, independent of physical co-location.
Learning Analytics Dashboards	Visualizes student engagement and performance data for instructors.	Informs differentiated instruction and timely interventions tailored to individual student needs.

4.2. Theme 2: The Persistence of the Digital Divide as a Primary Barrier

If the first theme represents the promise of hybrid learning, the second theme underscores its most significant peril. The literature overwhelmingly confirms that the digital divide, far from being solved, has been exacerbated and revealed in new, more complex dimensions by the push towards technology-dependent education. The pandemic laid bare that access is not a simple binary of having a computer or not, but a multi-faceted issue with profound implications for educational equity (UNESCO, 2020). The most basic layer, the access divide, involves disparities in the physical hardware (devices) and connectivity (reliable, high-speed internet). Millions of students globally, particularly in rural areas and low-income households, found themselves effectively locked out of education during school closures due to a lack of these fundamental resources (Azzolini et al., 2022). This was not merely an issue in developing nations; it was a pervasive problem in wealthy countries, highlighting deep-seated socioeconomic inequalities.

Beyond hardware and connectivity, the usage divide represents a more subtle but equally damaging barrier. This refers to inequalities in the digital literacy skills required to use technology effectively for learning. As Van Dijk (2020) articulates, digital inequality evolves from a focus on physical access to a focus on skills, usage, and ultimately, outcomes. A student may have a tablet and an internet connection but lack the skills to critically evaluate online information, navigate complex LMS interfaces, or

communicate effectively in a digital forum. Similarly, a teacher may be given a suite of advanced tools but lack the pedagogical training to integrate them in ways that enhance learning rather than simply digitize worksheets. These skills gap also extends to parents and caregivers, who are often expected to support children's learning at home but may feel ill-equipped to do so (Kraft & Monti-Nussbaum, 2021). This creates a "second-level digital divide" where the potential benefits of technology are accrued by those already possessing the cultural and social capital to leverage it.

The culmination of the access and usage divides is the outcome divide the widening of pre-existing educational achievement gaps. Research has consistently shown that students from disadvantaged backgrounds suffered greater learning losses during the pandemic, a direct consequence of unequal access to technology and support (Engzell et al., 2021). The hybrid model, if implemented without a deliberate equity lens, risks cementing these disparities. When learning becomes dependent on technology, those without equitable access are systematically marginalized, leading to lower grades, higher dropout rates, and diminished long-term opportunities. The literature is clear: failing to address the digital divide in all its dimensions will result in a hybrid future that is more technologically advanced but profoundly more unequal. This necessitates policy interventions that treat broadband access as a public utility, provide adequate devices for all students, and integrate digital literacy as a core component of the curriculum for students, teachers, and families.

4.3. Theme 3: The Non-Negotiable Investment in Educator Capacity

A consistent and powerful finding across the literature is that the effectiveness of any hybrid model is ultimately determined not by the sophistication of the technology, but by the capacity of the educator using it. The role of the teacher is undergoing a fundamental transformation, shifting from the primary source of knowledge ("sage on the stage") to a facilitator, curator, and designer of learning experiences ("guide on the side" and "learning designer") (Trust & Prestridge, 2021). This requires a new and expanded skill set that blends technological knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and content knowledge a concept often described as TPACK (Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge) (Koehler & Mishra, 2009). Teachers must become proficient not only in operating digital tools but, more importantly, in understanding which tool to use, when, and why to achieve specific learning objectives. This involves designing activities that effectively blend synchronous and asynchronous modes, fostering a community of inquiry in a distributed environment, and providing meaningful feedback through digital channels.

This profound shift underscores the critical need for high-quality, continuous professional development (PD). The literature strongly indicates that traditional, one-off workshop models are largely ineffective for building the complex skills required for hybrid teaching (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Instead, effective PD models are ongoing, collaborative, and job embedded. They include:

- Professional Learning Communities (PLCs): Where teachers collaboratively plan hybrid lessons, analyse student work, and problem-solve challenges.

- Instructional Coaching: Providing teachers with personalized, ongoing support from a skilled coach who can model strategies and provide feedback.
- Peer Observation and Collaboration: Allowing teachers to observe each other's hybrid classes (both physical and virtual) to share effective practices.

Crucially, effective PD must focus on pedagogy first, technology second. The goal is not to train teachers on every feature of a platform but to help them understand how to use technology to support powerful learning principles like collaboration, communication, and critical thinking (Trust & Whalen, 2020). Without this foundational support, even the most well-resourced hybrid initiatives are likely to fail, as teachers will either reject the new model or implement it in superficial ways that do not enhance student learning. Investing in educator capacity is, therefore, the most critical success factor for the hybrid future.

4.4. Theme 4: Redefining Success and Assessment

The transition to hybrid learning necessitates a parallel evolution in how student learning is measured and evaluated. The literature suggests that traditional assessment methods, particularly high stakes standardized tests and timed exams, are often misaligned with the goals and modalities of a hybrid environment. These methods tend to measure rote memorization and performance under pressure rather than the deeper learning, collaboration, and critical thinking skills that hybrid models aim to foster (Wanner & Palmer, 2015). Furthermore, the remote component of hybrid learning raises significant challenges concerning academic integrity, making traditional summative assessments difficult to proctor and validate.

In response, the literature points towards a shift to authentic assessment and continuous evaluation. Authentic assessments require students to apply their skills and knowledge to real-world, meaningful tasks, such as creating a portfolio, designing a solution to a complex problem, conducting a research project, or collaborating on a multimedia presentation (Villarroel et al., 2018). These methods are not only more engaging for students but are also more resistant to cheating and provide a richer, more holistic picture of student capabilities. Technology plays a key role in facilitating these new forms of assessment. E-portfolios, for instance, allow students to curate and reflect on their work overtime. Digital collaboration tools like Wikis or shared documents make the process of group work transparent and assessable. Furthermore, technology enables formative assessment to be seamlessly integrated into the learning process. Low-stakes quizzes, polls, and interactive activities within an LMS can provide teachers and students with real-time feedback on understanding, allowing for adjustments to instruction and learning strategies before a summative evaluation (Ifenthaler & Yau, 2020).

This shift represents a move from assessment of learning (summative) to assessment for and as learning (formative and authentic). It empowers students to take ownership of their progress and develops crucial metacognitive skills. However, this transition is not without challenges. It requires a significant investment in training teachers to design and evaluate authentic tasks, and it demands a cultural shift among stakeholders (including parents and policymakers) to value these complex

demonstrations of learning as much as they value standardized test scores. The literature concludes that for hybrid learning to truly fulfill its potential, assessment practices must evolve to become more flexible, authentic, and integrated into the learning process, providing meaningful data that guides instruction and supports student growth.

5. A Framework for an Equitable Hybrid Future

The analysis of the literature reveals that the trajectory of hybrid learning is not predetermined by technological advancement alone, but by the conscious policy, pedagogical, and support decisions made by educational systems. To ensure that the hybrid future is equitable, effective, and sustainable, a proactive and comprehensive framework is required. This framework moves beyond identifying challenges to proposing actionable recommendations across four interconnected pillars: infrastructure, pedagogy, teacher support, and digital literacy. The successful implementation of this framework demands collaboration among governments, educational institutions, EdTech developers, and communities to co-create a learning ecosystem that serves all students.

5.1. Infrastructure and Access as a Public Utility

The foundational pillar of an equitable hybrid future is the recognition that reliable, high-speed internet and adequate digital devices are no longer luxuries but essential utilities for participation in modern society and education, akin to electricity or water. The digital divide is, first and foremost, an infrastructure divide, and addressing it requires ambitious, publicly-funded policy interventions. Recommendations must target both connectivity and hardware. Governments should treat broadband access as a public good, investing in the expansion of high-speed fiber-optic networks to underserved rural and urban areas and exploring innovative solutions like community mesh networks (Alliance for Affordable Internet, 2021). Policy mechanisms can include subsidies for low-income families, regulatory changes to promote competition and lower costs, and direct public investment in infrastructure, mirroring historical efforts to electrify nations.

Concurrently, device access programs are critical. Schools and districts must be funded to provide one-to-one device programs, ensuring every student has a reliable, internet-enabled laptop or tablet. However, provision is not enough; support for maintenance, software updates, and technical assistance is essential to prevent new forms of inequality where some students have malfunctioning or outdated technology (Kraft & Monti-Nussbaum, 2021). Furthermore, equity in access extends to the home learning environment. Schools and community organizations can play a role by creating "homework hotspots" in community centers or libraries and providing resources for families to create conducive learning spaces. This holistic approach to infrastructure encompassing connectivity, devices, and environment is the non-negotiable bedrock upon which any equitable hybrid model must be built. Without this foundation, other efforts will inevitably fail, as they will only serve those already privileged with access.

5.2. Pedagogy-First Technology Integration

To avoid the pitfalls of using technology for technology's sake, a deliberate "pedagogy-first" model must guide all decisions regarding EdTech integration. This approach inverts the common process of selecting a tool and then figuring out how to use it. Instead, it begins with a clear articulation of learning objectives and pedagogical strategies, and only then identifies technology that can enhance or enable those goals. A useful model for this is the TPACK framework (Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge), which emphasizes the interplay between content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and technological knowledge (Koehler & Mishra, 2009). The goal is to develop a deep understanding of how technology can transform the teaching and learning of specific subject matter.

In practice, this means that schools and districts should adopt a critical stance toward EdTech procurement. The following questions should guide selection: Does this tool support active, collaborative, or constructivist learning? Does it provide accessibility features for diverse learners? Does it protect student data privacy? Is it intuitive and user-friendly to minimize cognitive load? This process prioritizes tools with high pedagogical value over those that are merely engaging or trendy. For instance, instead of adopting a complex VR system because it is novel, a pedagogy-first approach might lead a science teacher to use a simple simulation tool that allows students to visually manipulate variables in a physics experiment, directly supporting inquiry-based learning objectives. This mindset shift empowers educators to become critical consumers of technology, ensuring that EdTech serves as a means to an educational end, not an end in itself.

Table 2
A Pedagogy-First Technology Integration Model

Step	Key Question	Action	Outcome
1. Define Learning Objective	What should students know, understand, or be able to do?	Articulate clear, measurable learning outcomes based on curriculum standards.	A clear pedagogical goal, independent of technology.
2. Select Pedagogical Strategy	What is the best way to help students achieve this objective?	Choose instructional methods (e.g., collaborative problem-solving, direct instruction, independent inquiry).	A pedagogical plan for achieving the goal.
3. Identify Technological Enhancement	How can technology enhance or enable this pedagogical strategy?	Audit available tools for their ability to support the chosen strategy (e.g., a collaborative whiteboard for problem-solving).	A shortlist of potentially suitable EdTech tools.
4. Implement and Evaluate	Is the technology effectively supporting the learning objective?	Use the tool within the lesson, gathering feedback from students on its usability and impact on learning.	Data to inform future tool selection and pedagogical refinement.

5.3. Systemic Support for Teachers

The third pillar of the framework addresses the critical need for sustained, systemic support for educators, who are the primary agents of change in the classroom. As the literature review established, effective professional development (PD) must be ongoing, collaborative, and embedded in practice, moving far beyond the traditional "one-shot workshop" model. Recommendations for systemic support include the establishment of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) focused specifically on hybrid teaching. These PLCs provide a structured time for teachers to collaboratively design hybrid lessons, analyze student work from online and in-person settings, and problem-solve common challenges (Trust & Prestidge, 2021). This collaborative inquiry fosters a culture of shared responsibility and continuous improvement.

Furthermore, schools should invest in instructional coaching models. Instructional coaches, with expertise in both pedagogy and technology, can provide teachers with personalized, non-evaluative support. They can co-teach lessons, model new strategies, observe practices, and provide feedback, creating a safe environment for experimentation and growth (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). This type of job-embedded support is far more effective than abstract training. Finally, systemic support must include time and resources. Teachers need dedicated, paid time within their contracts for planning, collaboration, and PD. Administrators must create a culture that encourages innovation and acknowledges that the transition to effective hybrid teaching is an iterative process that will involve setbacks and learning. By investing in these forms of systemic support, educational institutions signal that they value teacher growth as the cornerstone of educational innovation.

5.4. Student and Family Digital Literacy

The final pillar of the framework recognizes that equitable access to technology is meaningless without the skills to use it effectively, responsibly, and safely. Therefore, building digital literacy for students and their support systems (families and caregivers) is paramount. For students, digital literacy must be integrated into the core curriculum, not treated as an add-on. This goes beyond teaching basic computer skills to encompass digital citizenship: critical thinking about online information, understanding digital footprints and privacy, engaging in respectful online communication, and recognizing cyberbullying (ISTE, 2016). Schools should adopt a scope and sequence for digital citizenship skills, ensuring they are taught developmentally from kindergarten through high school.

Simultaneously, family engagement and education are essential components of an equitable framework. Many parents and caregivers feel overwhelmed and ill-equipped to support their children's learning in a technology-rich environment (Kraft & Monti-Nussbaum, 2021). Schools can bridge this gap by offering workshops, creating clear guides in multiple languages, and establishing family help desks to provide technical support. These initiatives empower families to become active partners in their children's education, demystifying the technology and creating a supportive home learning environment. By investing in the digital literacy of the entire educational community, we ensure that technology becomes a tool for empowerment rather than a source of frustration or risk. This holistic focus on skills, for both students and their families, completes the framework, creating the conditions where the infrastructure, pedagogical tools, and teacher expertise can truly yield equitable outcomes for all learners.

6. Conclusion

6.1. Restatement of Thesis and Summary of Arguments

The COVID-19 pandemic served as a profound and irreversible catalyst, forcibly transitioning global education systems from traditional models to a reliance on technology-mediated instruction and, in doing so, setting education on an unambiguous path toward hybridity. This paper has argued that Educational Technology (EdTech) is a central pillar in this new landscape, but the ultimate trajectory of this hybrid future is not technologically predetermined. Instead, it will be shaped by the conscious choices of educators, policymakers, and society at large. The analysis has demonstrated that the shift from emergency remote teaching to intentional hybrid learning represents a critical evolution, moving from a reactive survival mechanism to a strategically designed educational paradigm. The exploration of the expanding EdTech ecosystem revealed its dual potential as both a powerful enabler of flexibility, personalization, and engagement, and a significant amplifier of pre-existing inequalities. The central thesis that the future is hybrid, but its equity and efficacy are contingent upon addressing foundational challenges has been supported by a synthesis of recent literature, highlighting the non-negotiable needs for robust digital infrastructure, a pedagogy-first approach, systemic teacher support, and comprehensive digital literacy. The path forward is not simply about adopting more technology, but about integrating it wisely, equitably, and in service of proven pedagogical principles to build a more resilient and inclusive educational ecosystem for the future.

6.2. Implications

The findings of this analysis carry significant implications for key stakeholders in the educational landscape. For policymakers at local, national, and international levels, the primary implication is the urgent need to treat digital access as a fundamental right and public utility. This necessitates substantial investment in broadband infrastructure, particularly in underserved communities, and the establishment of sustainable funding models for one-to-one device programs. Policy must also incentivize the development of open educational resources (OER) and ensure that EdTech procurement standards prioritize data privacy, interoperability, and pedagogical value over commercial appeal (Zhao, 2020). For educational institutions and leaders, the implication is the need for a strategic, whole-institution approach to hybrid learning. This involves creating a shared vision, reallocating resources to support continuous, job-embedded professional development for educators, and fostering a culture of innovation and collaborative inquiry among faculty. Leaders must champion the pedagogical shift required, ensuring that technology integration is always driven by learning objectives rather than technological novelty.

For EdTech developers and companies, the implication is a call for a more human-centered and ethically grounded design approach. Rather than creating products that seek to replace teachers or automate instruction, the focus should be on developing tools that empower educators, enhance human connection, and provide accessible, flexible learning pathways for diverse students (Reich & Ito, 2017). This includes designing for accessibility from the outset, ensuring transparency in data usage, and

actively collaborating with educators in the design process. Finally, for educators, the implication is the opportunity to embrace new roles as learning designers, facilitators, and data-informed mentors. This requires a commitment to lifelong learning and a willingness to experiment with new pedagogical models that effectively blend the best of in-person and online learning. Ultimately, the successful realization of an equitable hybrid future depends on the collaborative effort of all these stakeholders, aligned around the common goal of harnessing technology to expand, rather than restrict, educational opportunity.

6.3. Avenues for Future Research

This systematic review, while comprehensive, also highlights critical gaps in the current literature, pointing to essential avenues for future research. First, there is a pressing need for longitudinal studies that track the long-term academic, social, and emotional outcomes of students educated in well-implemented hybrid models. Much of the current research captures short-term adjustments or emergency responses; longitudinal data is crucial for understanding the sustained impact of hybrid learning on student achievement, engagement, well-being, and preparedness for higher education and the workforce (Bond et al., 2021). Such studies should compare outcomes across diverse student demographics to rigorously assess the equity impacts of different hybrid approaches.

Second, as technology continues to evolve, research must explore the pedagogical implications and effective integration of emerging technologies. The rapid advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AI), particularly generative AI, presents both unprecedented opportunities and significant challenges for hybrid learning. Future research should investigate how AI can be ethically leveraged for personalized tutoring, automated feedback, and supporting students with special needs, while also addressing concerns about academic integrity and the development of critical thinking skills (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). Similarly, the potential of Virtual and Augmented Reality (VR/AR) to create immersive, experiential learning environments in hybrid contexts warrants further empirical investigation to move beyond hype to proven educational value.

Third, to ensure the global relevance of hybrid models, a concerted focus on research in under-resourced contexts is imperative. The majority of published studies originate from well-funded institutions in high-income countries. There is a critical need for case studies and participatory action research that explore successful hybrid implementation in low-income, rural, and developing world contexts (Tahiru, 2021). This research should investigate sustainable models that work with limited bandwidth, low-cost devices, and large class sizes, contributing to a more globally inclusive understanding of hybrid learning. Finally, future research should continue to refine models for effective teacher professional development and explore the changing dynamics of assessment and credentialing in hybrid environments. By pursuing these research avenues, the academic community can provide the evidence base needed to guide the ongoing evolution of hybrid education toward a more effective and equitable future.

References

1. Alliance for Affordable Internet (2021) The costs of exclusion: Economic consequences of the digital gender gap. Web Foundation. https://a4ai.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/The-Costs-of-Exclusion_EN-1.pdf
2. Bergmann J, Sams A (2012) Flip your classroom: Reach every student in every class every day. International Society for Technology in Education
3. Bond M, Buntins K, Bedenlier S, Zawacki-Richter O, Kerres M (2021) Mapping the evidence of learning analytics in higher education research: A systematic review. Comput Educ 165:104136. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2020.104136
4. Bozkurt A, Sharma RC (2020) Emergency remote teaching in a time of global crisis due to CoronaVirus pandemic. Asian J Distance Educ 15(1):i–vi. https://www.asianjde.com/ojs/index.php/AsianJDE/article/view/447
5. Braun V, Clarke V (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Res Psychol 3(2):77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
6. Christensen Institute (2013) Blended learning definitions. https://www.christenseninstitute.org/blended-learning-definitions-and-models/
7. Darling-Hammond L, Hyler ME, Gardner M (2017) Effective teacher professional development. Learn Policy Inst. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/effective-teacher-professional-development-report
8. Firestone WA (1993) Educational Researcher 22(4):16–23. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X022004016. Alternative arguments for generalizing from data as applied to qualitative research
9. Garrison DR, Arbaugh JB (2007) Researching the community of inquiry framework: Review, issues, and future directions. Internet High Educ 10(3):157–172. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2007.04.001
10. Garrison DR, Kanuka H (2004) Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education. Internet High Educ 7(2):95–105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2004.02.001
11. Garrison DR, Anderson T, Archer W (2000) Critical inquiry in a text-based environment: Computer conferencing in higher education. Internet High Educ 2(2–3):87–105. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516(00)00016-6
12. Hodges C, Moore S, Lockee B, Trust T, Bond A (2020) The difference between emergency remote teaching and online learning. Educause Review. https://er.educause.edu/articles/2020/3/the-difference-between-emergency-remote-teaching-and-online-learning
13. Hodges C, Moore S, Lockee B, Trust T, Bond A (2020) The difference between emergency remote teaching and online learning. Educause Review. https://er.educause.edu/articles/2020/3/the-difference-between-emergency-remote-teaching-and-online-learning
14. Horn MB, Staker H (2014) Blended: Using disruptive innovation to improve schools. Jossey-Bass
15. Ifenthaler D, Yau JY-K (2020) Utilising learning analytics for study success: Reflections on current empirical findings. Technol Knowl Learn 25(2):387–392. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-020-

09434-w

16. International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) (2016) ISTE standards for students. https://www.iste.org/standards/iste-standards-for-students
17. Kavanagh S, Luxton-Reilly A, Wuensche B, Plimmer B (2017) A systematic review of virtual reality in education. Top Cogn Sci 10(1):1–12. https://doi.org/10.1111/tops.12278
18. King A (1993) From sage on the stage to guide on the side. Coll Teach 41(1):30–35. https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.1993.9926781
19. Koehler MJ, Mishra P (2009) What is technological pedagogical content knowledge? Contemp Issues Technol Teacher Educ 9(1):60–70. https://www.learntechlib.org/primary/p/29544/
20. Kraft MA, Monti-Nussbaum M (2021) The pandemic's effect on parent involvement in schools. Educ Next 21(4):38–45. https://www.educationnext.org/pandemics-effect-parent-involvement-schools/
21. Moorhouse BL (2020) Adaptations to a face-to-face initial teacher education course 'forced' online due to the COVID-19 pandemic. J Educ Teach 46(4):609–611. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2020.1755205
22. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, Shamseer L, Tetzlaff JM, Akl EA, Brennan SE, Chou R, Glanville J, Grimshaw JM, Hróbjartsson A, Lalu MM, Li T, Loder EW, Mayo-Wilson E, McDonald S, Moher D (2021) The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 372:n71. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71
23. Reich J, Ito M (2017) From good intentions to real outcomes: Equity by design in learning technologies. Digital Media and Learning Research Hub. https://clalliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/GIROReport_103017.pdf
24. Siemens G, Long P (2011) Penetrating the fog: Analytics in learning and education. Educause Rev 46(5):30–32. https://er.educause.edu/articles/2011/9/penetrating-the-fog-analytics-in-learning-and-education
25. Snyder H (2019) Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. J Bus Res 104:333–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039
26. Staker H, Horn MB (2012) Classifying K–12 blended learning. Innosight Institute. https://www.christenseninstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Classifying-K-12-blended-learning.pdf
27. Stommel J (2013) Decoding digital pedagogy, part 1: Beyond the LMS. Hybrid Pedagogy. https://hybridpedagogy.org/decoding-digital-pedagogy-pt-1-beyond-the-lms/
28. Tahiru F (2021) The state of educational technology in sub-Saharan Africa: A systematic review. Computers Educ Open 2:100045. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2021.100045
29. Trust T, Prestridge S (2021) The interplay of five elements of influence on educators' PLN actions. Teach Teacher Educ 97:103195. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103195
30. UNESCO (2020) COVID-19 educational disruption and response. https://en.unesco.org/covid19/educationresponse

31. Van Dijk JAGM (2020) The digital divide. John Wiley & Sons. As this is a book, a direct link is not provided], [Note
32. Viner RM, Russell SJ, Croker H, Packer J, Ward J, Stansfield C, Mytton O, Bonell C, Booy R (2020) School closure and management practices during coronavirus outbreaks including COVID-19: A rapid systematic review. Lancet Child Adolesc Health 4(5):397–404. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-4642(20)30095-X
33. Vygotsky LS (1978) Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press
34. Williamson B, Eynon R, Potter J (2020) Pandemic politics, pedagogies and practices: Digital technologies and distance education during the coronavirus emergency. Learn Media Technol 45(2):107–114. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2020.1761641
35. Xiao Y, Watson M (2019) Guidance on conducting a systematic literature review. J Plann Educ Res 39(1):93–112. https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X17723971
36. Zawacki-Richter O, Marín VI, Bond M, Gouverneur F (2019) Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education – where are the educators? Int J Educational Technol High Educ 16(1):39. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0
37. Zhao Y (2020) COVID-19 as a catalyst for educational change. Prospects 49(1):29–33. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-020-09477-y